



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WJ
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,880	09/27/2005	Willem Lubertus Ijzerman	NI 030299	1678
24737	7590	08/10/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			FINEMAN, LEE A	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2872	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/10/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,880	IJZERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lee Fineman	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The non-patent literature document listed on one of information disclosure statement filed 12 July 2007 has been lined through because it had already been considered in the other information disclosure statement filed 12 July 2007.

Drawings

2. Figure 5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 1 and 2.

4. The drawings are objected to because reference number 81 is indicated as a slit shadow mask in the specification but points to a light ray.

5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the inclusion of legal phraseology (e.g., comprises, means). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1-5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

It is unclear from the claim language how the device provides an autostereoscopic display. Are the pixels provided in a time multiplexed manner which are then scanned/directed to the appropriate eye? Or are the pixels interlaced for two views and scanned/directed to the appropriate viewer spot? For the purposes of examination, the pixels will be considered interlaced and scanned/directed to the appropriate viewer spot. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kajiki, US 5,694,235.

Regarding claim 1, Kajiki discloses in fig. 9 an autostereoscopic display device comprising a display array (17) comprising a number of addressable pixels (column 8, lines 38-45), and a means for addressing the pixels in the display array (see fig. 13), characterized in that the display device comprises a means for providing collimated light (14a) emitted by the pixels of the display array (18 in 17), a cylindrical lens (14b) for focusing the image displayed on the display array in a direction perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the cylindrical lens (fig. 9), the device further comprising a display screen (20) comprising a number of openings (in at least so far as the lenses have an opening for light to go through, see fig. 10) upon which the image displayed on the display array is in operation focused, and a scanning means (3) to sequentially scan over said openings on the display screen (fig. 9), and means (19) for changing the image information on the display array (17) in a rate corresponding to the frequency of scanning of the openings in the display screen (column 11, lines 12-18).

Regarding claim 2, Kajiki further discloses that the device comprises in, near to or on the display screen (20) cylindrical lenses (fig. 20, the lenses are in the screen).

Regarding claim 3, Kajiki further discloses that the display device comprises in between the scanning means and the display screen a lens (2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiki in view of Taguchi et al., US 5,850,580 (henceforth Taguchi).

Kajiki discloses the claimed invention except for the display device comprising index light sensors on or near the display screen. Taguchi discloses in fig. 21 producing a stereoscopic image (F) via scanning (34) and including an index light sensor (102) near the image to provide better registration/line up of the image (column 50, lines 32-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add index light sensors as taught by Taguchi to the system of Kajiki to provide better image registration/line up of the image on the screen (Taguchi, column 50, lines 32-36).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiki in view of Bhagavatula et al., US 6,137,456 (henceforth Bhagavatula).

Kajiki discloses the claimed invention except for the display device comprising a shadow mask in between the scanning means and the display screen. Bhagavatula teaches use of a

Art Unit: 2872

shadow mask (34) in an autostereoscopic system (fig. 1) to further control the divergence of light (column 5, lines 53-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a shadow mask as taught by Bhagavatula before the display screen in the system of Kajiki to further control the divergence of light and provide better three dimensional illumination (Bhagavatula, column 5, lines 53-61)

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Suganuma, US 2002/0071178 A1, and Favalora et al., US 2002/0135673 A1, disclose stereoscopic image displays with scanning elements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee Fineman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephone B. Allen can be reached on (571) 272-2434. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Lee Fineman
Patent Examiner
AU 2872
8 August 2007

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :9/27/05 & 7/12/07 (2 different IDS).